

EK

8 November 1984

Executive Registry

84-9877

Points from the first NTISSC Meeting:

- Donnelly introductory remarks (attached) precipitated a fierce discussion about whether the Chairman (Latham) could appoint the Chairmen of the two subcommittees. After much back and forth, we finally decided that he could, but only if a majority of the Committee did not oppose it. At one point during the debate I made the suggestion that we reconsider who would lead the subcommittee annually and if we didn't like the job we would change horses.
- The draft governing procedures (also attached) were mostly approved with a few minor alternations here and there.
- NCSC #10 came up late in the session. It was agreed that we would comment back to Latham later, as most of us had not had a chance to review it. There was much discussion about how we are going to get private sector ideas on government rule changes which may impact on corporations and Commerce undertook to think about that and make proposals to us.
- STAT - [] NSA, tried to explain an uncomprehensible chart on how the computer security budgets of all the federal agencies would be looked at. (Note that this problem hasn't gone away just because it got knocked out of one of the procedure documents.) Donahue said that OMB would not be bound by
STAT [] approach and the discussion ended.
- Most of the meeting was devoted to General Stilwell raising various objections to what Latham was trying to do. In particular, he didn't like the notion that NSA would chair the Subcommittee on Automated Informations System Security. With the understanding that if we did not like the job NSA was doing in this area, we would bring it to a vote in about a year, I supported Latham's proposal.

cc: DDCI
D/OC
D/ODP
D/P&PS/ICS
C/PS
EA/ExDir

DOI
EXEC
REGL-117
DD145

(B)

02 November 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Draft National Policy Re Space Systems

1. This draft has been circulating for approx one year in the NCSC environment. This is the third iteration and is significantly better than the first two. We concurred on the first draft because it had appropriate motherhood, etc., but I found out later that the Air Force did not concur because NSA had not addressed the * concerns. When they sent it back for coordination the second time, we did not concur because NSA still had not addressed the * concerns and from an Agency point of view DDS&T equities had not been addressed. The vote sheets and drafts are in the NCSC files.

Problem!

2. We discussed what needed to be done ^{state} to up-fix it at the last NCSC staffers' meeting and Dick Rapier pointed out things like when we order up a circuit via satellite the carrier signs up to provide the service. If circuit "A" is protected we are OK but if the carrier loses circuit "A" they will switch the circuit to an available satellite that may not be protected. The NSA reps were so naive that they thought that because Bell Central responds to an RFP for a protected circuit that they would never route the data via an unprotected circuit. As you can see that concern has not been overcome in this draft.

3. A number of reps supported this position and also brought up the fact that if the government or private industry is well along with platform development/production they may tell the U.S. Gov (NSA) to "bug off", that they aren't going to make any changes at this point. Therefore, the five year target date is unrealistic. The NSA reps stated that they had talked to industry and received assurances that all platforms could be protected in five years. Rapier's response to that was "fine, how about circuits via foreign birds, or downlinks operated by foreign PTT on foreign soil that will tell us to stuff it when we tell them that the data must be protected". The requirement to communicate will continue to exist and a national policy will not change the carriers' motivation to make \$\$\$.

STAT 4. The bottom line of all of this is we should brief the EXDIR that from an Agency point of view we do not concur with this draft. Send it back to the drawing board.

Wayne

* SAFSS

Page Denied

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Denied